



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/027,406	12/19/2001	Chen Li	12218-003001	2759

26181 7590 11/29/2004

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
3300 DAIN RAUSCHER PLAZA
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

CANGIALOSI, SALVATORE A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3621

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/027,406

Applicant(s)

LI ET AL.

Examiner

Salvatore Cangialosi

Art Unit

3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 April 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 3621

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

2. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Purpura (6421768) in view of Luckenbaugh et al (6311269) or Novicov et al (6275934).

Regarding claim 1, Purpura (See abstract, Figs. 1-2, Col. 1, lines 20-30, Col. 2, lines 20-30, Col. 3, lines 45-60 claims 1, 2, 19 and 36-38) discloses means for authenticating (registering) a user by means of a cookie in a browser substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of an information utility. It is noted that it is believed that the authentication by means of a cookie placed in a user browser is functionally equivalent to an information utility. Luckenbaugh et al (See Fig. 3A, 4, Col. 3, lines 40-60) or Novicov et al (See Fig. 1, Col. 7, lines 15-

Art Unit: 3621

35) show the registry storage of a web cookie for security and authentication. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Purpura because the browser cookie authentication are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations. Regarding cookie limitations of claim 2, Purpura (See abstract, Figs. 1-2, Col. 1, lines 20-30, Col. 2, lines 20-30, Col. 3, lines 45-60 claims 1, 2, 19 and 36-38) discloses means for authenticating (registering) a user by means of a cookie in a browser which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding claim 3, Purpura (See abstract, Figs. 1-2, Col. 1, lines 20-30, Col. 2, lines 20-30, Col. 3, lines 45-60 claims 1, 2, 19 and 36-38) discloses means for authenticating (registering) a user by means of a cookie in a browser substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of an information utility and a database. It is noted that it is believed that the authentication by means of a cookie placed in a user browser is functionally equivalent to an information utility. Luckenbaugh et al (See Fig. 3A, 4, Col. 3, lines 40-60 and Col. 5, lines 10-15) or Novicov et al (See Fig. 1, Col. 7, lines 15-35) show the registry storage of a web cookie for security including a relational database and authentication. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Purpura because the browser

Art Unit: 3621

cookie authentication and storage are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations. Regarding cookie limitations of claim 4, Purpura (See abstract, Figs. 1-2, Col. 1, lines 20-30, Col. 2, lines 20-30, Col. 3, lines 45-60 claims 1, 2, 19 and 36-38) discloses means for authenticating (registering) a user by means of a cookie in a browser which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the transaction limitations of claim 5, Luckenbaugh et al (See Fig. 3A, 4 Col. 5, lines 10-15) show cookie related to a transaction which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations.

Regarding user information limitations of claim 6, Purpura (See abstract, Figs. 1-2, Col. 1, lines 20-30, Col. 2, lines 20-30, Col. 3, lines 45-60 claims 1, 2, 19 and 36-38) discloses means for authenticating (registering) a user by means of a cookie in a browser which includes user data (Col. 3, lines 55-60) that is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the merchant limitations of claim 7, Purpura (See abstract, Figs. 1-2, Col. 1, lines 20-30, Col. 2, lines 20-30, **Col. 5, lines 15-35** claims 1, 2, 19 and 36-38) discloses means for authenticating (registering) a user by means of a cookie in a browser and connection to a merchant site which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the merchant limitations of claim 8, Purpura (See abstract, Figs. 1-2, Col. 1, lines 20-30, Col. 2, lines 20-30, **Col. 5, lines 15-35** claims 1, 2, 19 and 36-38) discloses means for authenticating (registering) a user by

Art Unit: 3621

means of a cookie in a browser and connection to a merchant site which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations.

Regarding claim 9, Purpura (See abstract, Figs. 1-2, Col. 1, lines 20-30, Col. 2, lines 20-30, Col. 3, lines 45-60 claims 1, 2, 19 and 36-38) discloses a method for authenticating (registering) a user by means of a cookie in a browser substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of an information utility. It is noted that it is believed that the authentication by means of a cookie placed in a user browser is functionally equivalent to an information utility. Luckenbaugh et al (See Fig. 3A, 4, Col. 3, lines 40-60) or Novicov et al (See Fig. 1, Col. 7, lines 15-35) show the registry storage of a web cookie for security and authentication. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Purpura because the browser cookie authentication are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations. Regarding cookie limitations of claim 10, Purpura (See abstract, Figs. 1-2, Col. 1, lines 20-30, Col. 2, lines 20-30, Col. 3, lines 45-60 claims 1, 2, 19 and 36-38) discloses means for authenticating (registering) a user by means of a cookie in a browser which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the two cookie limitation of claim 11, Novicov et al (See Fig. 1, Col. 7, lines 15-35) shows means for authenticating (registering) a user by means of two cookies in a

Serial Number: 10/027,406

6

Art Unit: 3621

browser which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Salvatore Cangialosi at telephone number (703) 305-1837. The examiner can normally be reached 6:30 Am to 5:00 PM, Tuesday through Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell, can be reached at (703) 305-9768.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patent and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to (703)872-9306

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park V, 2451 Crystal Drive, Arlington, Virginia, Seventh Floor(Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 3600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) **308-4177**.

Serial Number: 10/027,406

7

Art Unit: 3621

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


SALVATORE CANGIALOSI
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 222